7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967 SQ19 Tucano SQ19

000

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

ORGAN OF THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND AFFILIATED SOCIETIES

Ward H. Goodenough, *Editor*
Ann Raney, *Managing Editor*

Raymond D. Fogelson
Book Review Editor

Gordon D. Gibson
Film Review Editor

Associate Editors

Robert Ascher, William H. Davenport, Harold E. Driver, Robert H. Dyson, Jr., Dell H. Hymes, Francis E. Johnston, Igor Kopytoff, Ruben E. Reina, Robert J. Smith, William C. Sturtevant, Anthony F. C. Wallace

Dorothy Waters, *Editorial Assistant*

Volume 69—1967

Published by the American Anthropological Association

Officers of the American Anthropological Association

President: Frederica de Laguna, Bryn Mawr College
President-Elect: Irving Rouse, Yale University
Executive Board: Donald Collier, Field Museum of Natural History; F. Clark Howell, University of Chicago (*through 1967*); Harold C. Conklin, Yale University; David H. French, Reed College (*through 1968*); Conrad M. Arensberg, Columbia University; Helen Codere, Brandeis University (*through 1969*)
Secretary, Treasurer, and Executive Secretary to the Executive Board: Ch. Frantz. Suite 112, 3700 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20016
Editor: Ward H. Goodenough, University of Pennsylvania
General Counsel: Philip M. Glick

Editorial Council

Ward H. Goodenough, *American Anthropologist;* John Greenway, *Journal of American Folklore;* June Helm, *Publications* of the American Ethnological Society; Carl F. Voegelin, *International Journal of American Linguistics;* Frederick S. Hulse, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology;* Michael Kenny, *Anthropological Quarterly;* Robert E. Bell, *American Antiquity;* Marion Pearsall, *Human Organization;* Harry Basehart and Stanley Newman, *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology;* Gabriel [illegible]ker, *Human Biology;* Harold Hickerson, *Ethnohistory;* Frank Gillis, *Ethnomusicology;* Sol Tax, *Current Anthropology;* George P. Murdock and Alexander Spoehr, *Ethnology*

Issued six times a year during February, April, June, August, October, and December. Copyright © 1968 by the American Anthropological Association. All rights reserved. Printed by George Banta Company, Inc., Menasha, Wisconsin, U.S.A. Second class postage paid at Menasha, Wisconsin. Accorded the special rate of postage provided for in paragraph 4, section 538 P.L.&R. authorized August 22, 1922.

[Title Page 1]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967 SQ19 Tucano SQ19

000

Volume 69 Number 6
December 1967

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

On the Study of Social Change . . . . . FREDRIK BARTH 661

Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon . . . . . ARTHUR P. SORENSEN, JR. 670

Mushahara: A Nubian Concept of Supernatural Danger and the Theory of Taboo . . . . . JOHN G. KENNEDY 685

Kinship and Property Rights in a Buddhist Monastery in Central Ceylon . . . . . HANS-DIETER EVERS 703

Children and Conduct in a Ladino Community of Chiapas, Mexico . . . . . JOHN C. HOTCHKISS 711

A Design for the Study of Archeological Characteristics . . . . . ROBERT A. BENFER 719

Dorothy Way Eggan 1901–1965 . . . . . MILTON SINGER 731

Carol Ann Fisher 1929–1967 . . . . . DOUGLAS G. HARING 733

Published six times a year by the American Anthropological Association

[Title Page 2]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967 SQ19 Tucano SQ19

Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon[1]

ARTHUR P. SORENSEN, JR.
State University of New York at Binghamton

101
191
197
582

In the central Northwest Amazon, straddling the Brazilian-Colombian border, there is a complex linguistic situation involving more than 25 linguistic groups with a homogeneous culture. Almost every individual knows fluently three, four, or more languages. Only the Makú and the few non-Indians are monolingual. There are four linguae francae, but only tribal Tukano, doubling as a lingua franca, covers the entire area. The principal reason for this complexity is the insistence on tribal exogamy and the cultural identification of language with tribe. Consequently, a child begins with a personal linguistic repertoire of fluency in his mother's language as well as in his father's; to this he adds a knowledge of other languages in his vicinity. Contact with civilized people for 75 years has not significantly altered this linguistic situation, and periodic attempts to prohibit Indian languages have failed. The political boundary, which separates Portuguese speakers from Spanish speakers, reinforces the linguistic complex, for only Tukano, as a lingua franca, covers the entire culture area. Polylingualism in the individual, rather than monolingualism, is the cultural norm.

THE CULTURAL, SOCIAL, AND LINGUISTIC UNITS

Setting and Culture Area

In the central part of the Northwest Amazon, there is a large multilingual area encompassing many tribes, each possessing its own language, where almost every individual is polylingual—he knows three, four, or more languages well. The area of multilingualism coincides largely with the area in which the Tukano tribal language is a lingua franca. This area can be roughly defined as the Vaupés River and its tributaries. (The Vaupés flows into the Rio Negro, which in turn flows into the Amazon.) The region is the size of New England, or slightly larger. About half of it lies in Colombia and half in Brazil. The population is sparse, about 10,000.

161

13

The area is in tropical rainforest, its terrain transitional between rolling plain and hilly upland. Geologically it is the most westerly extension of the Guiana highlands. Although some of the rivers are large—the Vaupés is over 1,000 feet wide—navigation, because of the many rapids, is restricted to dugouts and to small boats that can be hauled. This has made for a relative inaccessibility that has helped protect the Indian culture, especially during rubber boom times. The area, however, has not been isolated: there has been continuous contact with civilization since the rubber booms began around 1875.

501

101
[361]

Most tribes occupy a delimited, continuous stretch of a river; a few have a discontinuous settlement pattern. Altogether they form one

[P. 670-A]

101 large, homogeneous cultural group in the center of what is identified in the literature as the Northwest Amazon culture area. (For culture area descriptions, see Steward 1946–1959, Goldman 1948, Murdock 1958, Steward and Faron 1959, and Galvão 1960.) There is historical as well as traditional evidence that some of these tribes may have originated outside of the Vaupés area, subsequently acculturating to the general central Northwest Amazon culture. Other tribes seem to have originated locally, from proliferation by fission. Koch-Grünberg (1909–1910), for instance, considers the Wanâno newcomers (among others). Although it has not been especially noted in the literature, some tribes present social organizations that are atypical for the area. The Piratapuyo, for instance, retain moieties, which until recently functioned as exogamous intermarrying units in an otherwise tribally exogamous and moiety-lacking culture area. Goldman (1963), who noted multilingualism, also reports on the diverse origin of various sibs among the Kubeo. On the other hand, field notes on the Tuyuka-Yurutí (or Dochkapūra-Uaiana [the *Uaikana* are the Piratapuyo]) set of tribes and languages suggest their derivation from a common source.

174 101 [616]

101 [131] A couple of the larger tribes do not live in one continuous area, but in several areas. The numerous Tukano tribe occupies several continuous stretches of the Vaupés River and its principal tributaries, the Tikié and the Papurí, and also sites at the mouths of tributaries to these rivers. Historically, they have exerted

[P. 670-B]

101 a dominant influence in the area. The Tukano tribal language serves as the lingua franca of
[191] the entire area. (Its use as a lingua franca antedates the appearance of other linguae francae in the region.)

The various tribes making up this large, homogeneous cultural group contain about 90 percent of the people in the area. The remainder consists of two ethnic groups. One is the Makú Indians, who live away from the rivers and are more or less nomadic. They do not intermarry with the riverine Indians. The other consists of the non-Indians, who call themselves *blancos* (in Spanish) or *brancos* (in Portuguese), and who number perhaps 1,500. Most of them live in the two or three air-strip towns. Their economy is centered around rubber gathering, and they include about 150 missionaries, who maintain some dozen missionary posts. The non-Indians have a strong monolingual tradition, speaking only either Spanish or Portuguese. They have shown little inclination to learn the Indian languages or to participate in Indian culture.[3] There is little intermarriage between Indians and *blancos* (who mostly consist of *mestizo-criollos*).

184 Here, then, is a large, culturally homogeneous area where multilingualism—and poly-
191 lingualism in the individual—is the cultural norm. Anthropologically, this is a culture trait, and it is an outstanding culture trait of the area.

Social Units

61 Social units of primary importance to the analysis of multilingualism in the central Northwest Amazon culture area are the nuclear family, lineage, sib, tribe, phratry; the longhouse group; the linguistic group; and the
[797] exogamy group. Secondarily important, as they represent aggregations from among the above, are the mission village, the rubber-working group (an incipient *patrón-peón* group), and the nationality group. In the structural interrelations of all these groups, the sib occupies a focal position.

Several nuclear families may be found in a lineage, and several lineages in a sib (or patrilineal clan), which is the named and localized unit of social organization. A tribe is a named political and ceremonial unit, consisting of several sibs; it has a separate history and is identifiable by a distinct language. Barring the few exceptions where some of its sibs belong to a different phratry from that of the major-

61 ity, each tribe is aligned with one of five phratries. Each phratry is a named, exogamous group of sibs that marries into the other phratries in the area. A phratry is not a political or ceremonial unit per se.

592 61 594 The basic political and ceremonial unit of the Northwest Amazon is the longhouse group, which is also the basic unit of economic redistribution. (The nuclear family is the basic economic unit *before* redistribution.) A new longhouse unit is often created by several classificatory brothers, not necessarily from the same parent longhouse. The one among them who is felt to have the best leadership qualifications becomes chief of the new longhouse group. Sometimes, also, a growing lineage group establishes a new longhouse, with its patriarch as chief. (Each nuclear family has its own area in the longhouse, and each married woman has her own hearth in this area; her husband smokes his fish and game on a rack lowered from the rafters above her hearth. All men and boys are served at one time at the center front of the longhouse by the women, who bring what they have individually prepared at their hearths, including some of their husbands' fish and game, and lay it out for all the men to share. After the men have eaten, the women and girls eat. Then each woman reclaims her own prepared food and what is left of her husband's catch.) A well-established longhouse group becomes, over a period of time, a cluster of lineages. A tribe is represented by a series of longhouses, located several hours' paddling distance apart from each other along a river and often situated at rapids for good fishing.

[251] [354] [264] [562] 61

619 197 The tribe is co-extensive with the linguistic group, which is composed of those individuals who are expected to have used the language as their principal language when they were children in their nuclear family of orientation. The language that identifies the linguistic group is, then, at once the father tongue, the longhouse language, and the tribal language of each member; it is *not* the language that identifies the mother's linguistic group.

61 582 The exogamic group is the phratry. Cultural emphasis is more on nonendogamy within the phratry than on prescribed exogamic alliances among the phratries (although suggestions of such may be found among some of the tribes). Informants, however, claim that the unit of exogamy is the tribe. The few exceptional cases of tribes whose sibs belong

[P. 671 - B]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

61
582 to more than one phratry are well known and are taken for granted as minor exceptions to the stated rule. This rule is expressed in a formula that one does not marry inside of one's own tribe-and-language group because one would then be marrying a brother or a sister. Although informants do not explicitly refer to it, they recognize exogamy at the phratry level, and all marriages conform to a rule of phratry exogamy as well as of tribal exogamy. Recognition of the multitribal composition of the phratry is expressed as: "A Tukano will not marry a Baré because the Baré are brothers and sisters with the Tukanos."

The exogamic phratry system is extended fictitiously to all tribes peripheral to and beyond the central Northwest Amazon area, even though members of these tribes may not themselves be aware that they fit into such a system. Despite this fiction, it is safe to assume that any marriage with a member of one of these tribes will be phratry-exogamous. The nonriverine, marginal Makú of the interior lands back from the Papurí River, with whom the riverine Indians described in this paper do not intermarry, are considered to belong to the phratries to which the Tukano belong (the "Tukano-Makú") and to which the Desano belong (the "Desano-Makú"), and are said to intermarry among themselves accordingly.[8]

621
797 A larger mission village is a unit that has been created by missionaries from two or more longhouse groups representing two or more tribes (hence linguistic groups) that have been required to tear down their longhouses, move together, and build separate adobe huts for each nuclear family. A larger mission village also contains a contingent of non-Indian missionaries and a boarding house of school children from nearby settlements. A smaller mission village is a single longhouse group that has been persuaded to tear down its longhouse and substitute a series of adobe huts, one for each nuclear family.

621
466
648 The rubber-working group, for the Indian, is a unit of eight to ten months' duration per year, to which he belongs over a period of several years, usually in his youth. There are a great many such groups in the Upper Vaupés-Apaporis rubber-gathering area, each operating out of a camp, to which the Indians of the Middle Vaupés region are recruited. Properly speaking, the group includes one or more non-

[P.672-A]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

466
621
648
[797]

Indians, who are the patrón and his foremen, but they tend to keep themselves apart socially and linguistically from their Indian workers. The rubber-working group forms economically a patrón-peón system, or, more precisely for the Vaupés area, a patrón-padre-peón system. A benevolent role of missionaries in the Vaupés has been to minimize the depredations and excessive abuses of the rubber-working barons by requiring them to acquire their Indian workers through the missionaries as middle men.

619
829

A clear distinction is made between tribal group and nationality; a word glossing as "landsmen" is the term used in Tukano for nationality group. There are two nationality groups among the multilingual Indians described in this paper—the Colombian Indians and the Brazilian Indians (the periphery of the multilingual area may include some Venezuelan Indians)—and even the members of the longhouses in the zone most unacculturated to "civilization" know whether they are Colombians or Brazilians. Also, Indians and non-Indians both agree that there are two clear-cut categories of people in the Vaupés: in Spanish these are called the *indígenas*, or Indians, and the *blancos*, or non-Indians (including Negros). However, the Indians feel uncertain and confused about ethnic and presumably "tribal" groups among the non-Indians. A favorite topic of conversation with me was inquiry about ethnic descent groups among such known nationality groups as Colombians, Brazilians, Venezuelans, and "Americans" (of the U.S.A.). Apparently the Indians are trying to set up a folk taxonomy for non-Indians within the Indian frame of reference. They have long been familiar with members of Dutch, German, English, Spanish, and Portuguese ethnic groups; they are confused about the nationality as against the ethnic status of some of these, especially of the latter two. Many Colombian and Brazilian nationals whom the Indians frankly regard as mestizos or creoles claim not only to be blancos but also "Spaniards" or "Portuguese"; yet they do not resemble the Dutch, German, or English blancos. (In Tukano the word for "blanco," best glossed from Spanish as "non-Indian," is derived from a form also used in the derivations of "fire, shotgun, fireplace"; the occasional blanco-sponsored request for a new form in Tukano that would gloss as "white" is consistently rejected.)

[P. 672 - B]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

829 Although the Indians reckon, for reference, in terms of ethnic groups, their attitude toward non-Indians is roughly the same as that of Americans in the United States toward European immigrants, who are looked upon as potentially becoming more and more American. I observed that Indians behold the visitor as potentially becoming more and more Indian-like unless he actively rejects Indian food, customs, and so forth. Most non-Indians are unaware of this attitude, and many would be contemptuous of it if they did know of it.

With respect to the Dutch, Germans, etc., an identifying criterion important to the Indian is that each of these ethnic groups is a separate language-bearing group. I was surprised that Indians do not naïvely assume that the English-speaking "American" necessarily belongs to the English ethnic group; the occasional North American traveler who insists (in Spanish) that he is "American" by *tribe* as well as by nationality is simply not believed. The North American who can be more explicit about his ethnic background is appreciated, especially if the background includes languages other than English and more than one ethnic group (thus simulating in form the exogamic language-bearing groups among the Colombian or Brazilian Indians). The Indians have also noted the widespread and, to them, notorious endogamy of the non-Indians and figure that there must be some sort of sib exogamy. The Indians ask a great deal about non-Indian marriage customs—partly because missionaries at times have suggested that the Indians' exogamy system is cumbersome and uncivilized, and that it promotes close cousin marriage, whereas the Indians feel that it is the non-Indian, with his lack of a clearly definable exogamy system, who is indiscriminate.

[582]
[797]

As for nationality-and-language, the Indians know that Spanish is the language of non-Indians on the Colombian side of the border and that Portuguese is the corresponding language on the Brazilian side of the border. They also know that Spanish is the language of Venezuela and that English is the language of "America." Nationality has no bearing on exogamy.

The Tribal Unit

619 In the central Northwest Amazon the term "tribe" has been used both for individual language-bearing units and for composites of these units sharing the same culture. In general

[P. 673-A]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

619 practice, the designation of "tribe" implies a distinct culture-bearing entity. But the use of "tribe" for social units in the central Northwest Amazon has been ambiguous because of the use sometimes of linguistic and sometimes of cultural criteria. The problem of identifying tribal units has been recognized on a more general level in South American ethnology by Steward and Faron (1959:17, 21), and the concept of "tribe" in the world-wide anthropological literature has most recently been challenged by Fried (1966), who indicates that assumptions regarding the diachronic and politico-evolutionary status of so-called tribes need re-examination.

619 192 The Tukano, Tuyuka, Barasana, and other Eastern Tukanoan-speaking Indians of the central Northwest Amazon have no simple term for "tribe" in their languages, nor for "lineage," "sib," "phratry." In discussion these units are designated by proper names (e.g., "the Tukanos") or, if the context is clear, by demonstratives suffixed with one of the various classifiers glossing as "group," "class," "persons," any one of which may pertain to any of these social units. When Spanish is used, however, *tribu* is applied by Indians to the language-bearing unit only, whereas *familia* and *grupo* are applied to various units, including the tribe. When an informant is asked to explain the meaning of "tribu" in Tukano (or in another Eastern Tukanoan language), he invariably gives the proper name of the language-bearing unit, and follows up further questioning about other social units by giving the proper names of those that he knows, especially of those in his own lineage-sib-tribe hierarchy, and he concludes with a statement such as, "They're all my relatives." If recourse is made to Spanish to explain a hierarchical arrangement, an informant will say something like "*Este grupo tiene tres grupos.*" In Tukano he would say, "This-group is three-groups: the 'Anteater' people are three-groups: the A are at X rapids, the B are at Y stretch of the Papurí River, and the C are at Z mission village." Linguistically, the name for the language is the name for the tribe in the plural possessive form, nominalized; the plural infinitive of the word for "to speak" is the form glossing as "language," and if this form also appears along with the tribal name, then the plural possessive form of the tribal name also appears but it is not nominalized.

[P. 673-B]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

619 As travelers, missionaries, and rubber-gatherers became familiar with the area, they noted that certain bonds of preferential hospitality and recognition existed among the long-house groups representing sibs of the same (father-) language group, and that this unit occupied a given, continuous territory. The missionaries and rubber-gatherers, as representatives of the colonial situation, tended to deal with each language-bearing unit separately, designating each one as a "tribe."

Nevertheless, some writers, such as Reichel-Dolmatoff (1963), have referred to the composite of all the Indian tribes (except the Makú) that share the same homogeneous culture and that participate in the system of exogamous phratries as the "Tukano tribe." In this definition, the social aggregate circumscribed by the phratry system is the tribe. Martius (1867) and Markham (1910) likewise spoke of the "Uaupés" Indians. Another argument for regarding this larger social unit as the one that could appropriately be designated as the "tribe" has been its tendency at times to be organized, partially at least, as a confederacy (Markham 1910). Continuing acculturation throughout the area at the present time may indeed lead to the loss of internal lines of social differentiation, resulting in the emergence of a single, regional society (Galvão 1959) in much the same way that the diverse Mapuche groups have emerged as a single tribe (Faron 1961). I believe that such a society here, unless interfered with, will retain a marriage system marked by exogamous, father-language groups of sibs.

At present, however, Indians recognize the set of longhouses speaking the same father-language as the maximal unit, and this is the "tribe" that is exogamous; that is, it is of these units that the exogamous phratry consists. As mentioned earlier, many of these units appear to have separate histories. The Indian identification of this exogamous, language-bearing unit as the maximal one is crucial in the analysis of multilingualism in the central Northwest Amazon. I shall use the term "tribe" in accord with this identification.[4]

Languages: Degree and Nature of Relationships

197 The criterion used in this paper to differentiate languages is mutual unintelligibility. The Indians' identification of tribe with language was initially relied on to prepare a

[P. 674-A]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

197 tentative list of languages, as the listing of "tribes" was ostensibly also a listing of "languages." For the many informants asked, the criterion of tribal distinctiveness includes, by their own cultural definition, mutual unintelligibility between languages. It seemed premature to construct formal tests to explore degrees of mutual intelligibility between languages that were obviously genetically related (Voegelin and Harris 1951), but when asked directly, informants confirmed their mutual unintelligibility. The field procedure [125] that I preferred and used was to watch for occasions when an Indian would comment that he had not understood someone else in a discussion where more than one language was spoken, at which time I would inquire what were the languages concerned. I depended on an Indian commenting in Tukano to identify nonunderstanding situations, but I was also able to pick up cues of "I don't understand" that I recognized in a number of the other languages. Thus I learned that such apparently closely related languages as Desano and Siriano, and even Tuyuka and Yurutí (see next two paragraphs), are mutually unintelligible. These and similar languages that are very closely related genetically make the central Northwest Amazon area an excellent one for close examination of the problem of language versus dialect (see Haugen 1966b).

Several language families are represented in this multilingual area: Eastern Tukanoan, Arawakan, Indo-European, Tupí-Guaranían, and others that remain undetermined (cf. Mason 1950, Noble 1965). Of these, the family most widely represented and with the largest number of languages is the Eastern Tukanoan, a family that seems to be contained entirely within the Northwest Amazon. The following discussion of my impressions is limited to this family.

I have made a preliminary attempt to reconstruct the Eastern Tukanoan family, using the comparative method on 13 of its languages on which I have field materials. The resulting subgroupings (see list in the appendix) definitely do not correlate with *phratric* groupings. Apparently the language most closely related to Tukano is Tuyuka, which is not intelligible to Tukano-speakers, not even "with difficulty." In phonology, morphology, and lexicon, one is considerably more distant from the other than Jutish is from Standard Danish (cf. Haugen 1955). However, in the field and on

[P. 674-B]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

197 paper a person can not help but note the close similarity between others of these languages, e.g., between Tuyuka and Yurutí, or between [191] Desano and Siriano. Discussions with informants of the Desano linguistic group, some of whom knew Siriano and some of whom did not, and with informants of the Siriano linguistic group, reveal that Sirano is not immediately intelligible to Desano-speakers but becomes largely intelligible after continuous exposure for at least several days. It so happens, however, that all members of the Siriano linguistic group know Desano, at least to understand it, because of polylingualism. Desano informants who know both Spanish and Portuguese recognize the relationship between Desano and Siriano as being on a par with that between Spanish and Portuguese (which are definitely recognized among Indians as being quite similar).

The degree of relationship among these Eastern Tukanoan languages can not be rigorously stated yet, but it is my impression that the languages separated by commas in the list in the appendix are a little farther apart than are the languages in the Romance group or in the Scandinavian group. One can look at the Romance languages as a dialect chain, but in the Eastern Tukanoan language family the *intermediate* "dialects" are missing, except perhaps for those languages in the appendix connected by "and." Central Algonquian languages (Bloomfield 1946, Hockett 1948) are more closely related than the Eastern Tukanoan languages seem to be. Approaching the problem from the opposite perspective, that is, from the point of view of reasonably demonstrated *dialects* within a language, the correspondences among the Eastern Tukanoan languages do not present the tightness or neatness that is so evident among those of the Karen dialects as drawn by Jones (1961).

Structural interrelationships are generally close among Eastern Tukanoan languages, but in the finer details of their similarities the languages do not coincide. In *broad* phonetic transcription, most of the Eastern Tukanoan languages share most of the same grid of phones, but the patterning of phonemes and the distribution of allophones vary from lan- [194] guage to language. (Eastern Tukanoan languages, incidentally, have phonemic tone and phonemic stress.) To the unaccustomed ear, the Eastern Tukanoan languages all sound fairly similar and, indeed, can be recognized

P.675-A]

197 as Tukanoan by contrast with Indian languages of other families. After a person becomes familiar with one of them, the other Eastern Tukanoan languages begin to sound different to him; but the "Tukano ear," while helpful in recording Eastern Tukanoan languages, turns out not to be helpful in recording phonetic detail from languages outside of the Eastern Tukanoan family. The speaker-hearer of an Eastern Tukanoan language is culturally very sensitive to the fine phonetic detail, which he perceives in the form of an "accent." Such detail varies considerably from language to language and, even within some languages, from region to region.

194 Phonologically, differences in accent reflect a number of things: allophonic fronting of vowels, or lowering of vowels; more opening or less opening of the mouth during production of the vowels; incomplete (versus complete) closure of obstruents in syllables that are not marked by strong stress; more or less contouring of canonically level tones in given environments. These differences are mostly very subtle in quality, and usually speaker-hearers are unable to describe the specific phonological details involved in what they hear as an "accent."

193 The morphologies of these languages are generally similar, but they vary considerably on specific points. There can even be said to be an Eastern Tukanoan type, but each language still has its own distinctive differences. For instance, most Eastern Tukanoan languages have only two general forms for person in the verbal paradigm, but not all: Piratapuyo has three. The participial system seems to be more developed in some languages than in others. In lexicon, there is again general similarity, but not coincidence, between languages. In the [601] exceptional area of kinship terminology, for example, more relatives may be distinguished in one language than in another, and what appear to be cognate terms in two languages may not refer to the same relative.

191 I have observed that when an Indian knows how to speak two closely related languages (of the sort connected by "and" in the appendix), he carefully and even consciously keeps them apart. It has occurred to me that the exogamic and other cultural institutions to be discussed below may be exerting a force that makes a speaker want to render closely related languages farther apart, even to an artificial extent, but so far I have detected no

191 linguistic innovations to this end. Here, however, I run the risk of overstating the dialect problem. As Weinreich has pointed out (1961: section 1.3), the learning of a new dialect presents the same situation as the learning of a new language.

193 The Eastern Tukanoan languages clearly share the same syntax. By this I mean that they share the same types of multiword constructions. For example, they share a preference for a series of clauses in parataxis with a strong avoidance of hypotaxis; the same preferred (and not rigidly fixed) word order prevails (subject-object-verb); the same kinds of multiword constructions are used as techniques for apposition, statements of purpose, and "afterthought" statements of consequences or conditions; the same procedure is followed for developing a discourse topic, the sentence being prolonged by clauses in parataxis so as to provide more and more specificity to an original proposition stated in a main, and usually first, clause; listeners show the same pattern of response, attentively, politely, or distinterestedly repeating the last verb of the speaker's sentence. (I do not have enough material from languages of the other Indian language families to be able to comment on their

191 syntaxes.) It is important for this discussion that Indian speakers do not ascribe the Tukanoan type of syntax to Spanish. Neither is the full syntactic range of Spanish as used by Colombian non-Indian Spanish-speakers found in the Indians' Spanish. As a result of much Spanish-to-Tukano and Tukano-to-Spanish work with informants, I can say that the Indians' Spanish is spoken in shorter and more numerous sentences than is the normal case in either Spanish or Tukano; dependent clauses are mostly lacking, with sentences supplied instead in an approximation of the paratactic subordinate clause of Tukano.

Further evidence comes from the response of Indians to metalinguistic questions. Monolingual Spanish-speakers, when quizzing Indians for forms in their language, typically ask for the forms one word at a time, following the order of the Spanish sentence (which may be phrased quite elegantly to ensure getting elegant Tukano). The translation process breaks down almost immediately; new Tukano forms for former Tukano forms are given as the Spanish sentence progresses, and the Spanish-speaker decides the Indian must be very indeterminate in whatever he says. The actual

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191 manner in which an Indian normally translates from Spanish to Tukano is so regular that it can be stated almost as a rule: the Indian remains silent until the full statement has been made in Spanish, he waits then for a few seconds until apparently the way he would say it in Tukano comes to him, and then he restates it in a normal Tukano sentence that generally has a syntactic structure very different from that of the Spanish sentence. This suggests that most Indians may be "coordinate" in their knowledge of Spanish and Tukano rather than "merged" (Weinreich 1953). Or, the cultural pattern may favor coordinate rather than merged control. This procedure can be enervating, culturally, to the monolingual Spanish-speaker, who expects to be replied to almost without audible pause between the end of his statement and the beginning of his responder's statement in rapid-fire repartee.

191 576 Anything said in Spanish is customarily repeated aloud in translation, even when all the Indians present already know Spanish. For the Indian, repeating a part of what a speaker says is a formal conversational device indicating understanding, assent (dissent if repeated with a negative suffix), and respect. In a formal gathering, as in the men's circle in the evening when the day's tasks are over, the amount of respect accorded to the older men who begin the session is indicated by how much the listeners repeat them. In the same setting, the remarks of a visitor speaking in another language are repeated in their entirety if someone present does not understand the language; as the conversation acquires more informal character and smaller conversation groups form, the repeating is dropped except for the respectful, assenting repeating of the last verbs of clauses and sentences; the visitor, indeed, may change to the language of the longhouse, if he knows it.

191 Repeating in translation something said in Spanish or Portuguese takes place in an interesting culture-contact situation. The encounter is rarely in a formal context for the Indian. It may be on a river bank, or on a trail, or on boats with the paddlers holding on to each others' boats and holding on to vines, or it may be on the street in a mission town. It almost never takes place in a formal gathering of Indians, as many situations calling for formal gatherings are discouraged by non-Indians. Nevertheless, many, or all, Indians of the settlement may be present.

[P. 676 - B]

?: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191 576 The repeating is first of all a respectful recognition of the Spanish-speaking non-Indians, but there also seems at times to be an additional quality of defensiveness connected with the practice. The repeating seems to serve as a stalling device so that the Indians can evaluate something of the intentions of the non-Indians, as indicated by their demands, their mood, and their degree of tolerance of Indian habits (for example, whether they permit beer, or admonish women—and men—for going without upper garments). Most non-Indians issue orders and interrogate loudly, according to the Latin American stereotype of the way to speak to Indians, rather than "converse" with them. The Indians, for various reasons, want to be sure that they have heard every question and order correctly. Consequently, repeating serves as a double-checking device, for corrections in translation are supplied unhesitatingly and immediately by other listeners following the translator. In sum, then, repeating is a formal conversational device indicating respect that also has an adaptive defensive function.

171 193 Inasmuch as the Eastern Tukanoan languages share the same general syntax, the Indians' ability to recognize and cope with the different syntactic system of Spanish suggests that other Indian languages and language families in the Northwest Amazon may have different syntactic structures, too.

191 Certain formulaic communication styles—regardless of Indian language family—are probably the same throughout the area, particularly greetings on entering a new longhouse in traveling. I have witnessed and participated in many such situations where the longhouse language was unknown either to me or to some of my Indian traveling companions, and always the content of the initial sequence of bilingual statements was clear to all (namely, the assertion that one has arrived; from which direction—upriver or downriver—one has come, and from what named spot; how many days one has been traveling; and who one's father and mother and brothers and sisters are, and how they are faring). There are other occasional formulaic conventions, especially those involving repeating, that can help a novice gain familiarity with a language. Many languages also seem to share interjections. (In these respects the central Northwest Amazon area may constitute what J. Neustupny has termed a *Sprechbunde* [speech

[P. 677-A]

191

area].) "Semicommunication" (Haugen 1966a) based on a partial knowledge of a language that is closely related to one already known may also occur.

MULTILINGUALISM

[611] Because descent is patrilineal in the North-
[582] west Amazon and residence is normatively and predominantly patrilocal, an individual belongs to his (or her) father's tribe, and to his father's linguistic group, which is also his
[591] own. Because of exogamy, his mother always represents a different tribe—tribal membership does not change for her upon marriage—and a different linguistic group. A woman invariably uses the language of the longhouse—her husband's language—when talking directly with her children. But she is usually not the only woman from her tribe in a longhouse. In a longhouse of any size there are usually several women of her tribe, as well as groups of other women from other tribes; and during the course of a day, these several groups of women usually find occasion to converse with each other in their own original languages.

[484] In addition to these multilingual contacts
[583] in the longhouse, others occur as a result of considerable traveling. Youths travel to investigate and evaluate available brides. A prospective bridegroom, if he does not know it already, learns his prospective wife's language from his prospective mother-in-law. Families also travel to visit relatives and affines. And there is travel for the sheer sake of travel.

A man's *mother's* language may be quite important because of the preferential mar-
[582] riage system. There is a preference, though not an obligation, to marry his cross-cousin,
[593] particularly his mother's brother's daughter, real or classificatory. (The kinship system is of Iroquoian type [Fulop 1955].) She will, of course, be of his *mother's* tribe and speak his *mother's* language. Therefore there is an added cultural incentive for a man to know his mother's language. If he has little opportunity to learn it—if she, for instance, is the only one of her tribe in the longhouse, and her tribe lives at a distance—his mother, nevertheless, will teach him lists of words in her language and how to say various things in it. Children are usually bilingual in both their father's and their mother's languages, but commonly use the former.

A child is frequently exposed to the other

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191 languages spoken in the longhouse by the married women, who are ordinarily from more than one outside tribe, and by visitors. Visitors, especially, expose him to the lingua franca (which may also be the father's language or the mother's language for some individuals). Most children remain bilingual or trilingual in speech (with the lingua franca Tukano as the third language) until adolescence.

In the course of time, an individual is exposed to at least two or three languages that are neither his father's nor his mother's language. He comes to understand them and, perhaps, to speak them. I observed that as an individual goes through adolescence, he actively and almost suddenly learns to speak these additional languages to which he has been exposed, and his linguistic repertoire is elaborated. In adulthood he may acquire more languages; as he approaches old age, field observation indicates, he will go on to perfect his knowledge of all the languages at his disposal.

191 592 Each individual, then, has a personal repertoire of languages. Each longhouse, too, has its own characteristic language repertoire. Thus, the second longhouse up the Inambú River is a Tuyuka tribe longhouse that speaks Tuyuka; one third of the married women there are from the Barasana tribe, another third from the Desano tribe, and another third from the Tukano tribe. Careful field checking definitely corroborates that all individuals of this longhouse actually control at least these particular four languages within their individual repertoires. Most individuals know other languages besides these, but all share the basic longhouse inventory. The longhouse language, Tuyuka, is used to men and among men; women use the longhouse language with each other, but women who are classificatory sisters and hence from the same tribe have the option of using their own language when women from another tribe are not actually in the active conversation group, although other women (and men) within hearing understand it. All children use the longhouse language (i.e., their father's) to both their father and mother. As one continues up the river to the next longhouse, the proportion of Barasana women increases as the proportion of Desano women decreases, although the same four languages remain in a common longhouse repertoire shared by the individuals of that longhouse.

P.678-A]

191 Eventually a point will be reached where one of these languages will drop out of the longhouse repertoire, and perhaps another language (e.g., Tatuyo or Paneroa) will enter.

I must emphasize again that it is not just scattered individuals who know the various languages used in a given longhouse; but *all* [797] the longhouse residents know them. In the mission villages, where what formerly were two, three, or more longhouses are now gathered together in one village of adobe huts, the linguistic picture resembles that of the single longhouse, but usually more than one father-language is present, for most missionary villages contain men from more than one tribe. There seemed to be an incipient age-grading pattern between two father-tongues at one of the missions, but not at the others.

Periodically the missions have tried to prohibit the use of Indian languages, but these efforts were subsequently dropped. In aboriginal settings, in the mission compounds away from face-to-face contact with the missionaries themselves, and in any gathering of Indians, whether traveling, visiting, working rubber, no Spanish or Portuguese is used (except occasionally when Indians drink alcoholic beverages!). The field worker must rely upon a knowledge of at least one of the Indian languages in order to keep track of what languages are actually being spoken.

The Indians are quite unself-conscious about their multilingualism. They take it for granted. There is no development of cross-linguistic puns. There is no stylistic device of switching from one language to another or of interspersing one's conversation with quotes from another language. Conversations in two or more languages indeed occur on occasion, as in visiting, but no one takes special note of it. Each individual initially speaks in his own father-language during such a conversation in order to assert his tribal affiliation and identification, but after a while the junior persons change, without comment, to the longhouse language, to Tukano as the lingua franca, or to another language, whatever one is most convenient for the others. A person usually cannot enumerate how many languages he knows, and is perplexed at being asked to do so. The interviewer has to go over with him one by one the whole list of languages spoken in the area. But when approached, in this way, each individual definitely knows his own repertoire and can state what languages

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191

he speaks well, what ones he only understands but does not speak, etc.[4]

I observed no tendency for people to claim knowledge of a language not actually known. I also observed that the Indians' terms for rating fluency, when translated into English, are *under*estimates. Thus when an Indian says he speaks such-and-such a language "some," we would be more prone in English-speaking culture to say he speaks it "quite well." The unequally weighted rating scale used by informants in Tukano is perhaps best rendered by these English glosses and paraphrases: (1) "none"; (2) "hardly any" or "just a few words"; (3) "some, but not *well*" ("well" referring to pronunciation), or "halfway"; (4) "*almost* all" or "just a little lacks"; (5) "all." To an unqualified question, an informant usually gives his *speaking* fluency rating. He must be questioned separately for ratings on languages he understands but does not speak or "hardly speaks." All these observations make it appear that the Indians are indifferent or, perhaps, blasé about their multilingualism.

Their orientation to multilingualism is instrumental and practical, but not devious. The languages used in a given situation are not chosen with motives of concealment from others. Politeness leads visitors to use their hosts' language, if they know it. Reliance on one language as against another is not considered impolite, however, and only on rare occasions, when such a reliance is exaggerated insistently and provocatively, can it signal the expression of anything resembling a militant tribal rivalry. This may, but need not, occur during beer-drinking bouts, as at a formally arranged product-exchanging and friendship-renewing ceremony between two longhouses representing two tribes; but here it should be viewed as a means for expressing and releasing accumulated, and usually minor, tensions rather than as a product of the drunken brawl pictured by most non-Indians. The stereotypes of unsympathetic non-Indians may have prejudiced accounts of some of the unsuccessful ceremonies that have received notoriety. Overt rivalry in most of these ceremonies seldom needs to go beyond the all-night competitive dancing of the separate rival troupes; and by the second day, the older men's chanting may end up entirely in the host-longhouse's language, while the younger men form one cooperative, consoli-

[576]
191
578

[P. 679-A]

191 578 dated dancing body. During the course of the ceremony, the women group according to their own tribal affiliations and sing as choruses in their own father-tongues. Married women alternate between singing in their original father-language, in their husband's language, and in the longhouse language of the hosts.

191 197 619 If neither one's father nor mother is Tukano, one nevertheless will speak Tukano as a lingua franca. Indirect evidence suggests that Tukano existed aboriginally, or at least early in the historic period, as a lingua franca, although its epicenter may have formerly been in the Lower Vaupés. The Tukano tribe may even have been the dominant group in a confederation or nation of sorts (Markham 1910). At any rate, the Tukano are widely and strategically located and appear to have exerted a dominant influence in the whole area. The Tukano claim a mild prestige as the senior sibs of the area and regard all the other tribes as younger-brother sibs in a particular rank order (see Fulop 1955); this ranking is accepted by the other tribes. Because the Tukano tribe is so widespread, almost every longhouse has at least one Tukano woman in it. Therefore, persons who do not have a Tukano for father or mother still have someone in their longhouse from whom they can absorb the correct pronunciation of Tukano.

197 Now, the Tukano language contains at least six dialects. As a lingua franca it is not pidginized but is learned in one or another of its tribal dialect forms, whatever one the learner is exposed to. Speakers for whom Tukano is not their father- or mother-language can still be identified as to regional dialect. Tukano, incidentally, is not an easy language to learn. It has a great many phonemes and an intricate tonal system; and apart from the tonal system, it has an intricate system of stress. This suggests the hypothesis that sheer intricacy may foster an all-or-none attitude toward learning to speak a phonologically elaborate language. Maintenance of Tukano as a lingua franca has probably been reinforced by there being some 25 or more language groups that it serves.

191 The Indians do not practice speaking a language that they do not know well yet. Instead, they passively learn lists of words, forms, and phrases in it and familiarize themselves with the sound of its pronunciation. The diverse and discrete phonologies of these languages and their dialects loom very prominently in

[P. 679-B]

191 the Indians' regard. They may make an occasional preliminary attempt to speak a new language in an appropriate situation, but if it does not come easily, they will not try to force it. One of the preconditions of language-learning in the area is a passive familiarity with lists of words (including inflected and derived forms) in languages likely to be learned. Much language-learning (especially of linguae francae) takes place within the peer group. Among closely related languages, a stage of "semicommunication" (Haugen 1966a) may be important in learning. Informants estimate that it takes them from at least one to two years to learn a new language fluently, regardless of language family. Most of them also estimate that it takes longer to learn Spanish than to learn Tukano or another Eastern Tukanoan language.

191 197 An Indian, then, does not want to try to speak a language until he knows it quite well. He is conscious of his pronunciation in it and deliberately tries to sound like an authentic speaker. Each language has its own phonetic niceties, nuances of voice placement, and other details of accent not unlike the sort that distinguish some regional dialects of American English. Some languages (e.g., Tukano, Desano, Kubeo) exhibit more than one accent because they have regional dialects. There is such a phenomenon, then, as speaking Tukano with a Tuyuka accent, and vice versa, although many Tuyukas speak Tukano without a Tuyuka accent. A mild Siriano accent is acceptable to speakers of the Upper Papuri River dialect of Tukano, where the Siriano tribe is located. A Tukano child of this area with a Siriano mother who has a Siriano accent in her Tukano will himself speak Tukano without a Siriano accent.

191 648 The early non-Indians who started coming into the area brought with them another language as lingua franca: Nheengatú (Inekatú), also called Tupí, and also commonly referred to as *lingoa geral* (which means "lingua franca" in Portuguese) or just "Geral." This is a Tupí-Guaraní language, and it is still spoken, even monolingually, along many portions of the Rio Negro by the detribalized Indian and White-Indian population, collectively known as *caboclos*. Nheengatú spread as the lingua franca of the early rubber boom days, 1875–1920. When the rubber boom declined with the development of rubber plantations in Malaysia, the use of Nheengatú declined also. Now only some older people in

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191 648 [797] 191 191 648 [P. 680-B]

the multilingual area described in this report know Nheengatú. Some younger people can repeat lists of words and forms in it, but they do not speak it. According to informants, it can be heard conversationally in the lower portions of the Vaupés, but I have not heard it used conversationally in the Middle Vaupés region. It was originally brought up the Amazon and to the Rio Negro by the Jesuits as the language of instruction; and it was well established there by the 18th century, when a contest with Portuguese began (Martius 1867). Its grammar, originally adapted from a Latin model, was artificially built on a Tupí-Guaraní base similar to that of present-day Guaraní.

After Nheengatú, Portuguese came in as another lingua franca. It is now the language of the non-Indians on the Brazilian side of the border and the language taught in the mission schools there.

On the Colombian side, Spanish is the official lingua franca. There was much learning of Spanish in the rubber-gathering area during the rubber boom, and Spanish superseded Nheengatú as the dominant lingua franca there. The increasing importance of Spanish at the expense of Portuguese and the already fading Nheengatú coincided with a change in the rubber industry: to extract the *siringa* type of rubber, found in abundance in the Upper Vaupés River and Upper Apaporis River region of interior Colombia, instead of the less valuable but more widespread *balata* type found in both Colombia and Brazil. The stability of Tukano during this period of change probably enhanced its position as a lingua franca. The Upper Vaupés–Upper Apaporis region is just outside of the culture area being described in this paper, and it includes Indian workers who have come in from still other culture areas. While the knowledge of Spanish is spreading, via this rubber-gathering area, into the adjacent culture areas, the knowledge of Tukano is also spreading.

For about 20 years there has been a concerted attempt to teach Colombian Indians Spanish in the schools. Perhaps one-third to one-half of the Indians already know Spanish as a second lingua franca. Many learned it when, as youths, they worked a few years in the rubber-gathering area. Theirs is good, understandable, and effective Spanish, although it may lack the subjunctive and certain other details of normative grammar. It

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191
648 cannot be called a "broken Spanish." At the missions, the insistence on using only Spanish has at times had an effect the reverse of the one desired and has invigorated Tukano and the other Indian languages. Along with measures to civilize the Indian linguistically and get him out of the longhouse and into civilized villages, there have been attempts to detribalize the Indians by de-emphasizing exogamy. All these efforts, however, have only served to reinforce the persistence of the native languages.

Because this area is politically divided by the boundary between Colombia and Brazil, an Indian from Brazil who knows Portuguese finds that when he goes any distance into Colombia, Portuguese is not understood. Conversely, Colombian Indians find they cannot use their Spanish in the interior of the Brazilian section. They then resort to their principal lingua franca, Tukano, which is understood on both sides of the border. And this situation obviously helps also in continuing Tukano as the main lingua franca.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SOME CURRENT ISSUES

The One Language/One Culture Image

101
197 As I have shown, the multilingualism in the homogeneous culture of the central Northwest Amazon area serves to demarcate distinct, exogamous social units. Homogeneity of culture in this area does not mean homogeneity of language. And to speak of one language is not to speak of one entire culture. Indeed, with minor regional variations, the larger Northwest Amazon cultural area extends far beyond the bounds of the central, multilingual area described in this paper. Moreover, the cultural area includes some societies acculturated to lesser or greater degree to civilization but whose populations still prefer to speak aboriginal languages and to coin new terms in their own languages rather than borrow alien words. Data from the central Northwest Amazon bear directly, therefore, on the prevalent one language/one culture assumption, which, as Hymes (1964) and Gumperz (1961) point out, needs critical review.

The homogeneous culture area of the central Northwest Amazon has been circumscribed, perhaps somewhat artificially, as the area characterized by multilingualism as a culture trait. Within it there is no one language that

[P. 681-A]

101 197 is father-language to all, nor is there any one language that is mother-language to everyone. What is father-language to some is mother-language to others and an unknown language to still others, all people who bear the same culture. The distribution of Tukano, as the lingua franca, does largely coincide with the extent of this culture area. But this is partly because a lingua franca accompanies multilingualism, and it is this trait of multilingualism that sets off the cultural area. The widespread distribution of Tukano and its near coincidence with the central Northwest Amazon culture area does not lend any special monolithic quality to Tukano such as is revealed in the promulgation of Spanish and Portuguese. Despite much situational reinforcement, Tukano continues to exist as a lingua franca at all only because it has tenuously and flexibly become amalgamated into the cultural picture. Indeed, the linguistic area of Tukano merges into the area of Nheengatú and thence into the area of Portuguese; the cultural areas of tribal Indians and of detribalized caboclos have perimeters that differ from those of the linguistic areas.[6]

191 *Implications for Transformational Linguistic Theory*

A number of details in the preceding description of the multilingual society in the central Northwest Amazon force some reconsideration of certain basic premises of transformational linguistic theory. Chomsky (1965:3–9) states that linguistic theory is concerned with the tacit knowledge of an ideally fluent speaker-hearer in a homogeneous speech community. An ideally fluent speaker-hearer in the central Northwest Amazon has to be someone who is *not* monolingual. This poses the question of whether the ideally fluent speaker is to carry one model of Language or several models, one for each of his languages, in his head. Even very closely related languages appear to be kept fastidiously apart by speakers, and the very differences among these closely related languages often are of the same kind of subtlety, especially of surface structure rules and near-surface structure rules, whose exposure has been a major contribution of transformational linguistics. This leads to the further question of how any one language, which forms only part of a normal polylinguistic individual's repertoire (which in turn varies from individual to individual), is to be accounted for. There is also the question of

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

191 what is to be considered a homogeneous speech community. I have suggested that the best candidates in this community are the long-house group and the mission village group, whose members share common poly- and multilingual patterns. This necessitates our recognizing hundreds of distinct homogeneous speech communities in the one culture area.

To treat the description of any *one* of these languages as representing the tacit knowledge of a speaker or the language of a speech community is clearly unrealistic. The one language represents only part of the individual's competence in Language, and only part of the speech community's configuration of languages. Description of only one language necessarily can account for only part of the grammatical sentences an individual within a speech community may utter—unless the description of a "single language" can incorporate several, or alternative languages. A linguistic theory limited to one language/one group situations is inadequate to explain the actual linguistic competence of the people of the central Northwest Amazon.

APPENDIX: INVENTORY OF TRIBES AND LANGUAGES

101 The following tribes and languages have been noted and checked directly in the field.

197 (1) Tribes and languages directly involved in multilingualism:

191 (A) Eastern Tukanoan language family, arranged in subgroupings suggested by a preliminary attempt at reconstruction by the comparative method (there are probably a few more languages to be documented in this group in subsequent field trips): Tukano, Tuyuka and Yurutí, Paneroa and Eduria, Karapana and Tatuyo, Barasana; Piratapuyo, Wanano; Desano and Siriano; Kubeo.

(B) Arawakan language family: Tariano; Baré. Most Tarianos now use Tukano as their household or father-language, and they marry Tukanos; many younger Tarianos do not know Tariano, although they are polylingual in other languages. The Baré along the Middle and Lower Vaupés use either Tukano or Nheengatú as their household or father-language, and very few speakers of the original Baré are left; the Baré are largely detribalized and caboclo-ized.

(C) Several tribes-and-languages of various families of the Pirá-Paraná (Mouer 1963) await direct checking in the field: Tabaino, Erulia (distinct from Eduria), Makuna,

101
197

Yekuana, Datuana, and others. The status of some of these as dialects or languages also remains to be determined. For example, Tatuyo informants have mentioned an Owa language spoken by some Tatuyos, but there has not been an opportunity to check this out. The few Miritítapuyo of the Middle Tikié appear to use either Tukano or Desano as their household or father-language.

(D) Tupí-Guaranían language family: Nheengatú.

101
197
191

(2) Tribes and languages bordering the multilingual area (many members of these tribes may be bilingual or even polylingual, but multilingualism is not widespread in a given tribe; many Indians of the multilingual area may include one or more of these languages in their repertoires):

(A) Arawakan language family: Kuripaka and Baniva. These are reported by some informants to be almost mutually intelligible.

(B) Undetermined language families: Karihona, Guayavero. I also have names, in Tukano only, of some dozen other languages spoken around the periphery of the area and along the Rio Negro.

(3) Languages spoken in the multilingual area, but by speakers who do not possess multilingualism as a culture trait:

(A) Undetermined language family: Makú (Makú may be more than one language). A few Makú know Tukano or Desano or some other language, including Spanish or Portuguese, but most Makú do not; a few Tukanos, Desanos, Piratapuyos, and Tuyukas know some Makú.

(B) Indo-European language family: Spanish, Portuguese, Italian. Two Colombian dialects of Spanish are found: Antioqueño, spoken by most missionaries, and Llanero, spoken by most rubber-gatherers. "Vaupense" Spanish is basically Llanero Colombian Spanish with the addition of many Nheengatú and some Portuguese terms for things pertaining to the tropical rainforest.[1]

(C) A special case is provided by languages neither spoken in the area nor represented there by groups of speakers. Small lists of words in Dutch can be obtained from older Indians on the Papuri, even though the former Dutch Montfortiano Fathers did not attempt to use Dutch with the Indians. Some Indians, moreover, have learned a considerable amount of Latin.

104

Spellings. Most names for languages and tribes in the literature are Nheengatú names, carried over into Spanish, Portuguese, Ger-

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

104 man, English, etc. There is great variation in the spellings. The spellings in this paper tend to follow those of Koch-Grünberg, who still remains the general authority for the area as a whole. His spellings are close to those used for Nheengatú. They generally conform with those used for world-wide ethnographic spellings; in addition, they seem to have been the spellings more commonly used in English, German, Portuguese, and Spanish ethnographies on South America.

101 *Population estimate.* Population figures are
161 hard to estimate. The following are very im-
191 pressionistic. Tribes with 1,000–2,000 members: Tukano, Kubeo, Baré; Spanish-only speakers. Tribes with 500–1,000 members: Piratapuyo, Wanano, Desano. Tribes with 150–500 members: Tuyuka, Yurutí, Paneroa, Eduria, Karapana, Tatuyo, Barasana, Siriano, Tariano, Tabaino, Makuna, Tekuana, Datuana; Portuguese-only speakers. Of the latter tribes, Yurutí, Yekuana, and Datuana may number [797] fewer than 150 members. A few Salesian missionaries, in Brazil, are Italians.

There are probably a few hundred Makú in occasional contract with the multilingual Indians in this area.

Non-Indians probably number about 1,500 and are concentrated in the few air-strip towns.

For a very round figure, a population of 10,000 has been estimated for the multilingual area in which Tukano is the chief lingua franca. Of these 10,000, only the non-Indians, the Makú, and some of the Kubeo are not multilingual, so that over 80 percent of the population is multilingual. As the non-Indians are concentrated in the few air-strip towns and a dozen missionary posts, the effective distribution of multilingualism is much higher; close to 100 percent of the communities encountered in the area are multilingual. Of the multilingual Indians, well over 90 percent know Tukano at least as a lingua franca, with young children accounting for the majority of the few who do not.

NOTES

[114] [12] [1] This report is an expanded version of a paper presented to the Tenth Annual National Conference on Linguistics in New York on March 13, 1965. Field work was done in the summers of 1959, 1960, and 1962 and from June to December 1963. It was supported during much of this time by USPHS Research Grant MH-17,258. I wish to acknowledge the hospitality and cooperation extended to me by the Xaveriano missionary order in Colombia and the Salesian missionaries of the Brazilian Vaupés region. Various drafts of this paper were read by Drs. Charles

[P. 683-A]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

000 Wagley, Harvey Pitkin, Robert F. Murphy, and Dell Hymes. I am indebted to them for their criticisms and encouragement.

797 [2] Notable exceptions have been Father Kök of the Montfortano Order, who was in the Colombian Vaupés until the late 1940's and wrote a grammar (1921-22), and Father Giacone of the Salesian Order, in Brazil, who has just published a grammar (1965, not yet seen by this writer; also 1939). Many missionaries can understand an Indian language to some extent and listen to confessions in it.

177 563 61- 582 [3] According to informants from the still-Indian Middle and Upper Vaupés area, the area of this paper, it seems likely that the *caboclo* population of the Lower Vaupés River and adjacent areas along the Rio Negro continues to observe some sort of exogamy. Cabocos are detribalized (deculturated) Indians who, through the processes of loss, acquisition, and intermingling of Indian and European (Portuguese) culture traits, have acculturated to a relatively stable but impoverished type of "backwoods," riverine culture. Caboclo culture depends on the extraction of natural products, such as rubber, accompanied by some subsistence farming, fishing, and hunting. The caboclo population functions as a marginal, and usually indebted, rural peasantry in the national economy (Wagley 1953, 1964; Oberg 1965). Much of the population living along the Amazon and its tributaries consists of cabocos. The caboclo population is mostly of the Indian physical type, but it may include some non-Indian admixture. The term "*caboclo*" is Portuguese; in Vaupense Spanish it is "**cabaco**," and in Tukano it is a form glossing as "mixed one." Some downriver segments of such Indian groups as the Tukano and the Desano, and particularly the Baré, are now considered by the other Indians as well as by the non-Indians to be cabocos.

000 [4] The identification of "tribe" with patrilocal language groups and, consequently, with a "linguistically and culturally hybrid social unit," suggests a possibility for widening the research problem recently described by Owen (1965). See Naroll (1964), also, on types of cultural units.

124 191 [5] These statements are based on 167 formally recorded interviews taken along the course of the Papuri and some of its tributaries, such as the Inambú and the Paca, and on the upper- to middle-Tikié. However, the representation by tribe, river, age group, mission, etc., is not comprehensive enough for a statistically controlled comparison. Many informants' statements were checked and double-checked, and some were cross-checked through other informants or at other times; they were found to be constant. Most interviewing was done in Tukano. Informants consistently tended to underestimate their linguistic repertoire, and these underestimates, as given, have been retained in the field notebook. I observed that, perhaps owing to the census-like nature of this activity, informants registered some uneasiness, although they did not cease to maintain rapport with the field worker, so the program was dropped and only occasional interviews thereafter were recorded. (In the following year a governmental census was indeed taken.) At one mission, I secured accurate data *about* each informant's linguistic repertoire, but the informants gave spurious names (each other's names in many cases) as a maneuver not aimed against the researcher but intended as a kind of practice session in preparation for coping with a locally rumored politico-religious threat based on missionary rivalry.

177 101 197 [6] There still exist abrupt cultural and linguistic lines of demarcation between Tukano and Spanish, which are separated from each other either by a geographical no-man's-land or by figuratively walled towns; but there is now a tendency to adapt to a caboclo type of culture on a semipermanent basis by some Indian nuclear families in the rubber-gathering Upper Vaupés-Upper Apaporis area. They represent a stage of acculturation similar to the one described by Steward and Murphy (1956) for the Mundurucú. Indeed, there are a number of parallels with the Mundurucú (Murphy 1960).

[P. 683 - B]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

114 [1] See Rivera's powerful, authentic novel *La Vorágine* (1948) for Vaupense Spanish terms. The setting for much of this novel is the Colombian Vaupés region and the adjacent Caquetá region (not dealt with, except indirectly, in this report). Rivera projected his morally and passionately torn protagonist, Arturo Cova, in ever-increasingly involved relief against the convoluted setting of the exploits of the notorious rubber barons. His Indians show up only as shadowy figures in the background—no doubt the way the rubber-gatherers, caught up in their own problems, saw them as they paused in dimly lit longhouses for their night's rest.

REFERENCES CITED

113

Bloomfield, Leonard
1946 Algonquian. *In* Linguistic structures of native America. Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 6. Pp. 85–129.

Chomsky, Noam
1965 Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press.

Faron, Louis C.
1961 Mapuche social structure. Illinois Studies in Anthropology, No. 1. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Fried, Morton H.
1966 On the concepts of "tribe" and "tribal society." Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences (ser. II) 28:527–540.

Fulop, Marcos
1955 Notas sobre los términos y el sistema de parentesco de los Tukano. Revista Colombiana de Antropología 4:121–164.

Galvão, Eduardo
1959 Aculturação indígena no Rio Negro. Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, n.s., No. 7.
1960 Áreas culturais indígenas do Brasil; 1900–1959. Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, n.s., No. 8.

Giacone, Antonio
1939 Pequena gramática e dicionario de lingua Tucana. Manaos.
1965 Gramática, dicionario e fraseologia da lingua Dahcese ou Tucano. Belem-Pará.

Goldman, Irving
1948 Tribes of the Uaupés-Caquetá region. BAE Bull. 143, Vol. 3:763–798.
1963 The Cubeo Indians of the Northwest Amazon. (Illinois Studies in Anthropology, no. 2). Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Gumperz, John J.
1961 Speech variation and the study of Indian civilization. American Anthropologist 63:976–988.

Haugen, Einar
1953 Review of four glossematic school descriptions of Jutish dialects. Language 31:141–147.
1966a Semicommunication: the language gap in Scandinavia. Sociological Inquiry 36:280–297.
1966b Dialect, language, nation. American Anthropologist 68:922–935.

Hockett, Charles F.
1948 Implications of Bloomfield's Algonquian studies. Language 24:117–131.

Hymes, Dell
1964 Directions in (ethno-) linguistic theory. *In* Transcultural studies in cognition. A. Kimball Romney and Roy G. D'Andrade, eds. Special Publication, American Anthropologist 66.3, Pt. 2:6–56.

Jones, Robert B.
1961 Karen linguistic studies. University of California Publications in Linguistics, Vol. 25.

[P. 684-A]

7: Sorensen E-5 (1959-1963) 1967
SQ19 Tucano SQ19

113

KOCH-GRÜNBERG, THEODOR
1909-10 Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern. Reisen in Nordwest Brasilien 1903-5. 2 vols. Berlin.

KÖK, P. P.
1921-22 Ensayo de gramática Dageye o Tokano. Anthropos, Vols. 16-17.

MARKHAM, CLEMENTS ROBERT
1910 A list of the tribes of the valley of the Amazons, . . . Journal of the Anthropological Institute 40:73-160.

MARTIUS, KARL FRIEDRICH PHILIPP VON
1867 Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerika's zumal Brasiliens. 2 vols. Leipzig, F. Fleischer.

MASON, JAMES A
1950 The languages of South America. BAE Bull. 143, Vol. 6, Part 4.

MOSER, BRIAN, AND DONALD TAYLOR
1963 Tribes of the Pirapararaná. The Geographical Journal 129, Pt. 4.

MURDOCK, GEORGE P.
1958 Outline of world cultures. 2d ed., rev. New Haven, Human Relations Area Files.

MURPHY, ROBERT F.
1960 Headhunter's heritage. Berkeley, University of California Press.

NAROLL, RAOUL
1964 On ethnic unit classification. Current Anthropology 5:283-291.

NOBLE, G. KINGSLEY
1965 Proto-Arawakan and its descendants. International Journal of American Linguistics Publication 38 (IJAL Vol. 31, No. 3, Part II).

OBERG, KALERVO
1965 The marginal peasant in rural Brazil. American Anthropologist 67:1417-1427.

OWEN, ROGER C.
1965 The patrilocal band: a linguistically and culturally hybrid social unit. American Anthropologist 57:675-690.

REICHEL-DOLMATOFF, GERARDO
1963 *Review* Irving Goldman, The Cubeo: Indians of the Northwest Amazon. American Anthropologist 65:1377-1379.

RIVERA, JOSÉ E.
1948 La Vorágine. Santiago, Chile, Zigzag Press.

STEWARD, JULIAN H., ED.
1946-1959 Handbook of South American Indians. BAE Bull. 143, vols. 1-6.

STEWARD, JULIAN H., AND LOUIS C. FARON
1959 Native peoples of South America. New York, Toronto, London, McGraw-Hill

STEWARD, JULIAN H., AND ROBERT F. MURPHY
1956 Tappers and trappers: parallel process in acculturation. Economic Development and Culture Change, Vol. IV, No. 4.

VOEGELIN, C. F., AND Z. S. HARRIS
1951 Methods for determining intelligibility among dialects of natural languages. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 45:322-329.

WAGLEY, CHARLES
1953 Amazon town: a study of man in the tropics. New York, Macmillan.
1964 The peasant. *In* Continuity and change in Latin America. J. Johnson, ed. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

WEINREICH, URIEL
1953 Languages in contact. 2d ed., revised & enlarged, 1962. New York, Linguistic Circle of New York.
1961 Unilingualism and multilingualism. *In* Linguistique. A. Martinet, ed. L'Encyclopédie de la Pléiade. Paris.

[P. 684 - B]